

## REMARKS

Claims 17-19, 22, 25 and 29 are presently cancelled. Claim 1-12 were previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 13-16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26-28 and 30 are pending.

Claims 13, 16-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent application publication No. 2002/0124082 (hereinafter Andres) in view of US patent No. 7,076,784 (hereinafter Russell). Claims 14 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andres in view of Russell and further in view of US patent No. 7,171,468 (hereinafter Yeung). Claims 15 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andres in view of Russell and further in view of US patent No. 7,017,121 (hereinafter Gilkas). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections, and further requests allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Independent claims 13 and 23 have been amended to highlight aspects of the present invention. For support see at least paragraphs [0009], see description in paragraph [0024] regarding FIG. 5 and the preceding conceptual background discussion in paragraphs [0022] and [0023] regarding Figs. 3 and 4. Applicant believes that the prior art of record does not describe or suggest each of the structural and/or operational relationships of the claimed invention, as presently amended. For example, it is not believed that the prior art of record describes or suggest to graphically differentiate logically subordinate objects from a logically co-equal object by “graphically identifying said at least one logically co-equal object by a corresponding icon positioned adjacent to said at least one component along a common row on the display mechanism”, as set forth in independent claim 23, or by “wherein said at least one logically co-equal object is graphically identified by a corresponding icon positioned adjacent to said at least one component along a common row on the display mechanism”, as set forth in independent claim 13. Additionally, it is not believed that the prior art of record describes or suggests a graphical arrangement where “the location of the plurality of icons corresponding to the logically subordinate objects, the location of the icon corresponding to said at least one logically co-equal object, and the respective locations of the second and the third selection means in combination result in forming a graphical arrangement on the display mechanism consistent with the logical arrangement of the logically structured data”, as set forth in independent claims 13 and 23.

Serial No. 10/588,705  
Atty. Doc. No. 2003P18371WOUS

Accordingly, the §103 rejections noted in the Office Communication are no longer relevant and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of the claims pending in this application recites patentable subject matter and it is further submitted that such claims comply with all statutory requirements and thus each of such claims should be allowed.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16(c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 24, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood  
Janet D. Hood  
Registration No. 61,142  
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830